

VZCZCXRO2477

RR RUEHAG RUEHAST RUEHBC RUEHBZ RUEHCHI RUEHCN RUEHDA RUEHDBU RUEHDE
RUEHDF RUEHDT RUEH DU RUEHFL RUEHGI RUEHHM RUEHIK RUEHJO RUEHJS RUEHKUK
RUEHKW RUEHLA RUEHLH RUEHLN RUEHLZ RUEHMA RUEHMR RUEHPA RUEHPOD RUEHPW
RUEHRN RUEHROV RUEHSR RUEHTRO RUEHVK RUEHYG
DE RUCNDT #0880/01 2902333
ZNR UUUUU ZZH
R 172333Z OCT 07
FM USMISSION USUN NEW YORK
TO RUEHC/SECSTATE WASHDC 2811
INFO RUCNAFG/AFGHANISTAN COLLECTIVE
RUEHXX/ARAB ISRAELI COLLECTIVE
RUEHEE/ARAB LEAGUE COLLECTIVE
RUEHXS/ASSOCIATION OF SOUTHEAST ASIAN NATIONS
RUCNDSC/DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE COLLECTIVE
RUEHZK/ECOWAS COLLECTIVE
RUEHZL/EUROPEAN POLITICAL COLLECTIVE
RUEHXX/GENEVA IO MISSIONS COLLECTIVE
RUEHXL/INDIAN OCEAN COLLECTIVE
RUCNISL/ISLAMIC COLLECTIVE
RUCNMGH/MAGHREB COLLECTIVE
RUEHZG/NATO EU COLLECTIVE
RUCNSAD/SADCC COLLECTIVE
RUEHIN/AIT TAIPEI 0065
RUEHUB/USINT HAVANA 0209

UNCLAS SECTION 01 OF 04 USUN NEW YORK 000880

SIPDIS

SIPDIS

E.O. 12958: N/A

TAGS: [PREL](#) [PTER](#) [UNGA](#)

SUBJECT: UNGA/C6: POSITIVE REACTION TO U.S. COUNTER
TERRORISM STATEMENT

REF: A. 06 USUN NEW YORK 2221

[1](#)B. 05 USUN NEW YORK 2424

[1](#)1. SUMMARY: Seventy-four delegations addressed the Sixth Committee during the debate on counterterrorism on October 10 - 11. As in previous years, delegations strongly condemned acts of terrorism, called for measures to promote tolerance and eliminate the root causes of terrorism and rejected attempts to link terrorism with any religion, culture, or race. Reactions to the U.S. statement were positive; EU and CANZ delegations took particular interest in our support for the Global Counterterrorism Strategy. Some delegations continued to advocate for the inclusion of concepts such as State terrorism and the right to self-determination in a universal definition of terrorism. As expected, Cuba, Venezuela and Trinidad and Tobago criticized the U.S. handling of the Luis Posada-Carriles case. As to the work program of the Sixth Committee, speakers urged all delegations to reinvigorate their negotiating efforts and agree on the draft Comprehensive Convention on International Terrorism as soon as possible. END SUMMARY

[1](#)2. During the October 10 - 11 Sixth Committee debate on counter terrorism (item 108), seventy-three countries, plus Interpol, addressed the Sixth Committee. The following delegations delivered statements:

October 10: Vietnam, the Dominican Republic (on behalf of the Rio Group), Australia (on behalf of CANZ), Benin (on behalf of the Africa Group), Portugal (on behalf of the EU), Trinidad and Tobago (on behalf of CARICOM), Cuba (on behalf of NAM), Tajikistan, Pakistan, Liechtenstein, Switzerland, Russia, Egypt, Thailand, Kuwait, Iceland, Burma (Myanmar), Turkey, Oman, Bahrain, Libya, Colombia, Zambia, and the Republic of Korea.

October 11: Guatemala, Bangladesh, Tunisia, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Malaysia, Sudan, Algeria, Maldives, Tanzania, Singapore, Morocco, Ukraine, Ghana, Sri Lanka, Syria, Belarus, Nigeria, El Salvador, Burkina Faso, Madagascar, Indonesia, Qatar, Botswana, Cambodia, Cuba,

India, China, Cameroon, Mexico, Mongolia, Venezuela, Moldova, Iran, Mozambique, Sierra Leone, Jordan, United Arab Emirates, United States, Kenya, Yemen, Japan, Iraq, South Africa, Israel, Uganda, Angola, the Philippines, Afghanistan, Palau, Niger, Interpol and Cuba in a right of reply to the United States.

¶3. John Sandage, Chief of the I/O Counterterrorism and Sanctions Policy Office, delivered the U.S. statement. The full text of the statement is contained in para 7. The UK, Portugal, Spain, Canada, Australia and Italy reacted positively to the U.S. statement, expressing appreciation for the demeanor of the U.S. speaker and the innovative ideas contained in his remarks. The delegates were pleased to hear support in our statement for the efforts of both the Security Council and the General Assembly in implementing the Global Counterterrorism Strategy.

Common Themes on Counterterrorism

¶4. The overall substance of the debate differed little from previous years (reftels). All delegations condemned terrorism and recognized the global scope of the problem. Australia on behalf of CANZ delivered a particularly strong statement, asking delegates to set the global standard that terrorism can never be justified. The Australian representative warned that while terror networks have been disrupted, there is no room for complacency. Australia emphasized its deep concern about the resurgence of Al Qaida in the Pakistan/Afghanistan border area and the emergence of "Al Qaida franchises" in Africa and the Middle East. As to prevention, some delegations made appeals to address the root causes of terrorism by eradicating poverty, inequality and by

USUN NEW Y 00000880 002 OF 004

promoting tolerance through interfaith and intercultural dialogue. On this point, delegates emphasized their rejection of any attempt to link terrorism with any religion, race, culture, or ethnic origin. Many countries also used the debate to discuss their national and regional counterterrorism efforts. Turning to the work of the Sixth Committee, delegates called for conclusion of negotiations on the draft Comprehensive Convention on International Terrorism (CCIT) as soon as possible.

Self-Determination and State Terrorism

¶5. Several states, representing the Non-Aligned Movement, Organization of Islamic Conferences, and the Africa Group, continued to press for the inclusion of concepts such as the right to self-determination and State terrorism in the CCIT. Among the statements delivered, eighteen countries referred to the right of self-determination and seven countries spoke specifically about State terrorism. Libya and Syria raised the need to address the activities of armed forces in the CCIT. Taking aim at Israel, the United Arab Emirates condemned the "state terrorism carried out by the Israelis in the occupied territories." Syria put its own issues ahead of the Palestinians to characterize Israel's "illegal settlements" in the Golan Heights as an example of "systematic state terrorism."

U.S. Critics

¶6. Cuba, Venezuela and Trinidad-Tobago reserved part of their statements to criticize the U.S. over the release of Luis Posada Carriles, a Venezuelan citizen suspected of bombing a Cuban airliner in 1976. Cuba accused President Bush of double-standards and tolerating terrorism against Cubans while harboring a known terrorist. Venezuela called

on the U.S. to respond to its request for Posada's extradition. The U.S. presented the points in para 8 to clarify U.S. actions with respect to Posada. Cuba exercised a right-of-reply to emphasize that the U.S. had charged Posada with immigration violations, not for crimes related to terrorism or his alleged attempts to assassinate Fidel Castro.

17. Text of U.S. Statement:

BEGIN TEXT:

Statement by John B. Sandage
Chief, Counterterrorism and Sanctions Policy
Bureau of International Organization Affairs
United States Department of State

Mr. Chairman, and fellow delegates, thank you for the opportunity to speak on this important question.

Global terrorism remains one of our greatest collective challenges. It affects the way we live our lives, raise our families, travel to other nations, carry out business. No geographic region is immune. No individual can feel totally safe from this modern day plague. The vast majority of the victims of terrorism have been innocent civilians. In 2006, the majority of victims were followers of the Islamic faith. Last year, attacks on children were up more than 80 percent, with more than 1,800 children killed or injured in terrorist attacks. The terrorists also targeted the workers essential to civilized society. They targeted police. They targeted government leaders. They targeted teachers. They targeted journalists. And they targeted diplomats.

The international community is working together to confront these extremists because they threaten the right of people everywhere to live in peaceful, just, secure neighborhoods

USUN NEW Y 00000880 003 OF 004

and societies. Joined together, through the UN, we have collectively said "enough." The unanimous adoption of the Global Counterterrorism Strategy is a testament to that collective will. And it is one the United States welcomes. The United States remains strongly committed to supporting the efforts both of the General Assembly, and the Security Council, toward this end.

We must measure counterterrorism success in the broadest perspective. While capturing and bringing to justice key terrorist actors is fundamental in combating terrorism, these actions do not eliminate the threat. We can destroy terrorist leadership, disrupt terrorist networks, and eliminate terrorist safe havens, but unless we start eroding terrorist recruitment and the expansion of terrorist groups' global reach, we won't be successful in eliminating terrorism. We must thus employ all the tools of statecraft to establish long-term measures to marginalize terrorists. We must also seek to build trusted networks of governments, private citizens and organizations, multilateral institutions, and business groups that will work collaboratively to defeat the threat from violent extremism and its radical ideology. Such networks, over time, help wean at-risk populations away from subversive manipulation by terrorists, and they create mechanisms to address people's needs and grievances, thus marginalizing the terrorists.

The US strategy to defeat terrorists is structured at multiple levels: a global campaign to counter violent extremism and disrupt terrorist networks; a series of regional collaborative efforts to deny terrorists safe havens; numerous bilateral security and development assistance programs that are designed to build liberal institutions, support law enforcement and the rule of law, to address political and economic injustice and to develop military and security capacity.

But we, the global community, need to do better at galvanizing public opinion to reject violence as an unacceptable means of expressing any type of grievance. These grievances may include geo-political issues, lack of economic opportunity, ethnic conflict, governance issues, corruption and political injustice. Violence can never be an acceptable way to express or address these grievances. Effectively countering violent extremism means creating pathways for alienated groups to redress their legitimate grievances without joining the terrorist network.

Toward this end, I am pleased to be able to share with you that the United States has pledged to the Counterterrorism Strategy Implementation Task Force a voluntary contribution of nearly one-half million dollars to support programs to address the issue of radicalization and extremism, and to protect vulnerable infrastructure. We call on those Member States in a position to do so to respond to the Task Force's call for contributions. We believe that the Task Force, under the leadership of Assistant Secretary-General Robert Orr, and with the active involvement of the entire UN Secretariat, is doing laudable work.

SIPDIS

We as Members must match that effort. We must continue to work closely together in building and supporting effective multilateral mechanisms for combating terrorism, including the long-pending Comprehensive Convention on International Terrorism. We must ensure the full and effective implementation of the Strategy. And we must continue to cooperate with the Security Council's three counterterrorism committees, to ensure that our obligations under the Charter are fully implemented, and that those Member States having the will, but not the capacity to fulfill these obligations, get the help they need to do so.

We look forward to hearing the views of others and, we hope, reports of great progress in our collective effort. I thank you for your attention to my remarks.

USUN NEW Y 00000880 004 OF 004

Mr. Chairman, I would also like to offer a few factual clarifications on the case of Luis Posada. The United States has taken a number of legal actions with respect to Mr. Posada.

In taking these steps the United States has acted consistent with international law as well as our domestic legal framework that provides for due process and various constitutional safeguards.

As with all democracies around the world that follow the rule of law, as opposed to other systems of governance, these safeguards provide that an individual cannot be brought for trial or extradited unless sufficient evidence has been established that he committed the offense charged. In the United States, this standard is described as "probable cause."

Let me give you a brief overview of steps the United States has taken with respect to Posada within this legal framework:

Posada entered the United States illegally in early 2005.

Posada was detained by immigration authorities in the United States on May 17, 2005, and he was, in accordance with U.S. law, placed in removal proceedings.

The immigration judge who handled the removal proceedings ordered that Posada be removed from the United States on September 27, 2005.

This order remains in effect. The United States has been seeking ways to implement it consistent with the terms of the order and U.S. regulations that implement the obligations of

the United States under the Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment.

Moreover, the United States sought and obtained a criminal indictment charging Posada with violations of our immigration laws. The U.S. district court handling that case recently dismissed the indictment. As is well known, our judges are wholly independent of the Executive Branch. They enjoy tenure for life, and are fiercely independent. This federal judge, sitting not in Florida but in Texas, reached her decision according to her reading of the law. In our system, as in all those that respect the rule of law, a decision by the courts must be obeyed unless and until it is overturned by a higher court. The United States filed a notice appealing the district court's decision dismissing the case on June 5, 2007, but that appeal has not yet been decided.

Posada also remains under investigation for past activities.

In the meantime, Posada remains subject to the order of removal issued by the immigration judge and is without legal status in the United States.

He is also subject to an Order of Supervision from the Department of Homeland Security, Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), which imposes certain restrictions on Posada, including reporting and monitoring requirements.

In sum, the United States continues to be engaged in an ongoing series of actions, consistent with our legal requirements, due process, and the rule of law with respect to Posada.

END TEXT.

18. I/O Counterterrorism and Sanctions Policy Office Chief John Sandage cleared this message.
KHALILZAD